

REMARKS

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of objection and/or rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants assert that the present invention is new, non-obvious and useful. Prompt consideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Status of Claims

Claims 1, 3-54, 56-105, and 110-111 are pending.

Claims 1, 3-54, 56-105, and 110-111 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 19, 24, 25, 35, 36, 54, 73, 78, 79, 87 and 88 were amended. No new matter was introduced. For example, the amendments of claims 1 and 54 find support, for example, in paragraph [0085]. The amendments of claims 24, 25, 35, 36, 78, 79, 87 and 88 find support, for example in paragraphs [0080] – [0082].

New claims 112-117 were added. No new matter was added. The amendments find support, for example, in paragraph [0069]. No fees are due - as fees were already paid for five other claims which were cancelled.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3-39, 54, 56-91, and 110-111 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Zhang et al (US Patent 6,891,854) in view of Bennett et al (US Patent 6,421,359) and further in view of Shindo et al. (US Patent 7,146,507). These rejections are being traversed.

Claims 1 and 54

Zhang

Zhang discloses a system that changes a bit rate of media streams (abstract; figures 2A- 2C, 3, 4, 5).

Zhang teaches of modifying media streams – especially modifying all video data. All video data passes through a bit rate converter (box 202 figure 2a, box 202 figure 2c, box 302 figure 3, boxes 404-408 figure 4, boxes 514-518 figure 5, boxes 604-608 figure 6, boxes 702-704 figure 7, boxes 802-806 figure 8, box 902 figure 9, box 1100 figure 11, box 1204 figure 12, box 1304 figure 13).

Thus- Zhang teaches of a modifying process that is applied to all the video data – and teaches away from applying a modification process that can not be applied on any of the video data.

Zhang does not teach of encryption at all. Encryption of video is contrary to Zhang – as Zhang converts all video data by bit rate converters while encrypted video can not be bit rate converted.

Especially - Zhang does not teach of multiplexing encrypted and non-encrypted media components.

Bennett

Bennett teaches of a system for adding transport streams to provide a legal output transport stream (abstract). Figure 6 illustrates of multiple media streams (each including audio, video and data) – (see figure 6 and column 13, lines 9-34). These are not different types of media streams but merely different media streams of the same type – and each includes audio, video and data.

Shindo

Shindo teaches of an information recording apparatus that encrypts and recodes media streams (Abstract, figure 1, box 16 of encryptor and box 61 of HDD). Referring to figure 1 of Shindo – audio-visual data is received by a memory controller 13, send to a memory, then is encrypted by an encryptor 16 and sent, via HDD controller 21 and memory 22 to HDD 61.

Shindo does not teach of bit rate shaping - as it teaches of storing media streams in a hard disk drive – as is not related to bandwidth constraints that may require bit rate conversion.

Combination of Shindo, Bennett and Zhang

The Office argues that it would be obvious for one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Zhang, Bennett and Shindo – and that one is motivated as such to provide a modification unit that receives different sets of media streams which is configured to perform encryption on a specific media stream from a set of media streams to provide secure connection between the communication device.

The Applicants respectfully disagrees with the argument made by the Office and argue that the combination is not proper under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for the following reasons:

Zhang does not teach of encryption at all and even **teaches away** from encrypting video components – as Zhang provides all video data to a bit rate converter and assumes that all video data can be modified by the bit rate converter – while encrypting video data prevents encrypted video data from being rate shaped.

Bennett does not teach of different types of media streams or encryption at all.

Shindo does not teach of bit rate shaping.

Therefore, the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 1 and 54 is traversed and claims 1 and 54 should be allowed. The examiner is requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 1 and 54 and of claims 3-39, 110, 56-91 and 111 dependent upon claims 1 and 54 respectively.

Claims 18, 19, 20, 72, 73 and 74

Claims 18, 19 and 20 were rejected in view of Zhang.

Zhang does not teach of encryption. He merely teaches bit rate shaping. The bit rate shaping may include splitting a video stream to its components – motion vectors, coefficients and additional data (figure 5, block 504), VLC decoding these elements (figure 5, boxes 506-510) then modifying (bit rate shaping) each of these components (figure 5, boxes 514, 516

and 518) and multiplexing these components (figure 5, box 526). This process differs from encryption.

Zhang does not teaches or suggests of encrypting media streams, does not teach of multiple distinct versions of an encrypted media stream and especially does not teach or suggest of selecting an encrypted version of a media stream out of multiple distinct encrypted versions – as recited in claim 18.

Zhang does not teach or suggest of encrypting media streams, does not teach of multiple distinct versions of an encrypted media stream, does not teach or suggest of selecting an encrypted version of a media stream out of multiple distinct encrypted versions and especially does not teach or suggest distinct encrypted versions that differ from each other an encryption level – as recited in claim 19.

Zhang does not teach or suggest of encrypting media streams, does not teach of multiple distinct versions of an encrypted media stream and especially does not teach or suggest selecting an encrypted version of a media stream out of multiple distinct encrypted versions and especially does not teach or suggest that the distinct encrypted versions differ from each other by the manner that they were generated – as recited in claim 20.

Bennett and Shindo do not cure the deficiencies of Zhang and should not be combined to Zhang.

The same arguments raised in relation to claims 18-20 are applicable to the rejection of claims 72-74.

Therefore, the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 18-20 and 72-74 is traversed and claims 18-20 and 72-74 should be allowed. The examiner is requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 18-20 and 72-74.

Claims 21, 23, 28, 29, 32, 75, 77, 82, 83 and 86

Zhang does not teach an encryption and especially does not teach or suggest a determination that is followed by **altering an encryption of a media stream** – as recited in claim 21.

Zhang does not teach an encryption and especially does not teach or suggest **assigning encryption priorities** to media stream components and whereas encryption is altered in response to the at least one control parameter and the encryption priorities – as recited in claim 23.

Zhang does not teach an encryption and especially does not teach or suggest at least one control parameter that is determined **in response to an encryption scheme** applied on media stream components – as recited in claim 28.

Zhang does not teach an encryption and especially does not teach or suggest **assigning encryption priorities** to media stream components and determining at least one control parameter in response to the encryption priorities – as recited in claim 29.

Zhang does not teach an encryption and especially does not teach or suggest **selecting between encrypted media stream components** and non-encrypted media stream components – as recited in claim 32.

Bennett and Shindo do not cure the deficiencies of Zhang and should not be combined to Zhang.

The same arguments raised in relation to claims 21, 23, 28, 29, 32 are applicable to the rejection of claims 75, 77, 82, 83 and 86.

Therefore, the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 21, 23, 28, 29, 32, 75, 77, 82, 83 and 86 is traversed and claims 21, 23, 28, 29, 32, 75, 77, 82, 83 and 86 should be allowed. The examiner is requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 21, 23, 28, 29, 32, 75, 77, 82, 83 and 86.

Claims 24, 25, 35-39, 78, 79 and 87-91

Zhang teaches of a system that operated in a multi-layered communication system. The layers includes, for example a video compression layer, a transport layer and an ADSL layer (column 15, lines 53-57). Alternatively, the layers include MPEG 2 transport stream layers and multiple ATM layers (column 18, lines 39-51). In each case, a single video stream is converted to different communication layer representations.

Zhang does not teach or suggest representing a (single) media stream by multiple layers that are generated by a process that comprises quantizing the media stream by different quantization levels, and altering at least one layer, deleting one layer or adding a new layer – as recited in claim 24.

Zhang does not teach or suggest a (single) media stream that is represented by multiple layers that are generated by a process that comprises quantizing the media stream by different quantization levels and **altering the selection of layers that undergo encryption** – as recited in claim 25.

Zhang teaches of a single video compression layer media streams and does not teach or suggest at least one media stream of the set that is represented by multiple video layers and at least a portion of at least one layer is encrypted – as recited in claim 35.

Zhang does not teach or suggest of a supplemental layer, does not teach or suggest of at least one media stream of the set that is represented by multiple video layers and at least a portion of at least one layer is encrypted and especially does not teach or suggest layers that comprise a base layer and at least one supplemental layer, a supplemental layer for each pair of layers – as recited in claim 36.

Zhang does not teach or suggest of a supplemental layer, does not teach or suggest of at least one media stream of the set that is represented by multiple video layers and at least a portion of at least one layer is encrypted and especially does not teach or suggest layers that provide spatial scalability- as recited in claim 37.

Zhang does not teach or suggest of a supplemental layer, does not teach or suggest of at least one media stream of the set that is represented by multiple video layers and at least a portion of at least one layer is encrypted and especially does not teach or suggest of such layers that provide temporal scalability – as recited in claim 38.

Zhang does not teach or suggest of a supplemental layer, does not teach or suggest of at least one media stream of the set that is represented by multiple video layers and at least a portion of at least one layer is encrypted and especially does not teach or suggest of such layers that are generated by filtering – as recited in claim 39.

Bennett and Shindo do not cure the deficiencies of Zhang and should not be combined to Zhang.

The same arguments raised in relation to claims 24, 25 and 35-40 are applicable to the rejection of claims 78, 79 and 87-91.

Therefore, the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 24, 25, 35-40, 78, 79 and 87-91 is traversed and claims 24, 25, 35-40, 78, 79 and 87-91 should be allowed. The examiner is requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 24, 25, 35-40, 78, 79 and 87-91.

Claims 40-52, 92-105

Zhang

Zhang teaches of a system that operated in a multi-layered communication system. The layers includes, for example a video compression layer, a transport layer and an ADSL layer (column 15, lines 53-57). A single video compression layer stream is converted to different communication layer representations.

The layers of Zhang do not provide spatial scalability or temporal scalability as they represent the single video stream in the video compression layer.

Thus- Zhang does not teach or suggest of a multiple layers that represent a media stream to provide at least one out of a spatial scalability and a temporal scalability – as recited in claims 40 and 47.

Kollmyer teaches of an encryption bridge that may encrypt portions of data (Abstract).

Kollmyer and Shindo do not teach of such multiple media layers that represent a media stream and provide at least one out of a spatial scalability and temporal scalability – as recited in claims 40 and 47.

The same arguments raised in relation to claims 40 and 47 are applicable to the rejection of claims 92 and 99.

Therefore, the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 40, 47, 92 and 99 is traversed and claims 40, 47, 92 and 99 should be allowed. The examiner is requested to withdraw the

35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 40, 47, 92 and 99 and of claims 41-46, 48-53, 93-98 and 100-105 dependent upon claims 40, 47, 92 and 99 respectively.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants assert that the pending claims are allowable. Their favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Although Applicants may disagree with statements made by the Examiner in reference to the claims and the cited references, Applicants are not discussing all these statements in the current Office Action since reasons for the patentability of each pending claim are provided without addressing these statements. Therefore, Applicants reserve the right to address these statements at a later time if necessary.

Should the Examiner have any question or comment as to the form, content or entry of this Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

Respectfully submitted,

/OREN RECHES/

Oren Reches
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 53,506

Dated: March 18, 2011

Reches Patents

211 North Union Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
United States
Tel: (703) 838 5568
Fax: (703) 683 4707